cl. *avj* „serpent" (cf. lat. *anguis*, lit. *angìs*, v. slave *ǫžь*) ⇒ Vn(69) Š(206) U(39) *oc*;

cl. *arajin* „premier" ⇒Vn *ärčin* (81), Š *heŕči(n)* (192), U *ärčin* (39), G *ǝŕači* (166);

cl. *verǰ* „fin" ⇒Š(205) *verǰ*, Vn(293) *verǰ* (mais dans le même dialecte on a cl. *sterǰ* „stérile" ⇒*steŕč*; ibid., p. 292), U *verǰ* (40).

B) sourdes classiques — sourdes (après nasale sonores) dialectales:

cl. *panir* ⇒Vn(287) Š(204) U(204) G(182) *panir*;

cl. *tun* „maison" ⇒Vn(295) Š(206) U(207) *tun*, G(186) Kb (Gh. 236) *ton*;

cl. *kov* „vache" ⇒Vn(272) Š(199) U(199) *kov*, G *kav* (176);

cl. *cuŕ* „courbé" ⇒Vn(268) *cuŕ* „fou", Š(198) U(198) *cuŕ*, G *coŕ* (174);

cl. *čaš* „repas" ⇒Vn(278) Š(201) U(201) *čaš*, G *čäš* (178);

cl. *kapoyt* „bleu" ⇒Vn(80) Š(199) *kapot*, U *kaput* (199), G(175) Kb *kᵛäpüt* (Gh. 236);

cl. *mukn* „souris" (cf. gr. μῦς, lat. *mus*, v. slave *myšь*) ⇒ Vn(281) Š(202) U(202) *muk*, G(180) Kb(Gh. 236) *moknǝ*;

cl. *ayc* „chèvre" ⇒Vn(244) Š(192) U(191) G(165) Kb(Gh. 236) *ec*;

cl. *kočak* „bouton" ⇒Vn(74) Š(199) U(199) *kočak*, G *kᵛučak* (176); mais après nasale on a:

cl. *ǝnker* „compagnon" ⇒Vn(259) U(195) *ingᵛer*, Kb *hingᵛer* (Gh. 236), Š *ǝngᵛer* (196), G *hǝnger* (170);

cl. *ǝntrel* „choisir" ⇒Š *ǝndrel* (196), U *ǝndǝrel* (195).

C) sourdes aspirées classiques — sans changements:

cl. *phčel* „souffler" ⇒Vn(297) Š(206) U(207) *phčel*, G *phačil* (187);

cl. *khacaχ* „vinaigre" ⇒Vn(298) Š(207) *khᵛacaχ*, G(188) U(208) *khacaχ*;

cl. *thaphel* „verser" ⇒Vn(260) U(196) *thäphel*, Š *thaphel* (196), G *thaphil* (171).

Remarque: les consonnes palatalisées ont été indiquées par ᵛ.

WOJCIECH SKALMOWSKI

ELAMITE AND AKKADIAN TRANSLATIONS OF THE OLD PERSIAN PERIPHRASTIC PERFECT

Old Persian reveals in its verbal system an innovation, viz. a periphrastic construction of the type *mihi factum* (*est*), which plays a major role in the subsequent reshaping of the Iranian verbal system. In OP it is restricted to one stem only [1], viz. *kar-* „to do, to make", but its essential features are clearly visible: it consists of a nominal (personal pronoun or noun) in the genetive-dative case and of a passive past participle on *-ta-* in nom. sg. n., cf. *tya manā kartam*, „what I have done", *tyamaiy piça kartam*, „what my father has done". Since W. Geiger [2] has stressed the passive origin of this construction, its active function has not been generally recognized; R. G. Kent in his fundamental work *Old Persian* [3] is still treating it as a passive. The first linguist to point out the active character of this construction in OP and its functional equivalence with the well-known type *habeo factum* is Professor J. Kuryłowicz [4]. The same explanation was later offered by E. Benveniste [5]. Benveniste compares the OP construction with the Armenian type *nora ē gorceal*, „eius est factum" = „habet factum" and stresses that OP has a distinct

[1] DNb 53 *tyataiy gaušayā [χšnūtam]* is based on a restoration and its Elamite and Akkadian translations are destroyed.

[2] *Die Passivkonstruktion des Präteritums transitiver Verba im Iranischen*, in: *Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth*, Stuttgart 1893, p. 1—5.

[3] New Haven, 2-d ed. 1953 (further quoted as: K.).

[4] *Les temps composés du roman*, Prace Filologiczne, XV, 2 (Warszawa 1931), pp. 448—53 (= *Esquisses linguistiques*, Wrocław—Kraków 1960, pp. 104—8).

[5] *La construction passive du parfait transitif*, BSL XLVIII, 1 (1952) = *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, ed. Gallimard 1966, pp. 176—86 (farther quoted as: Benv.; pages according to the book-edition).

passive construction based on -ia-stems and a kind of ablative of the agent, formed by the preposition hacā „from", and an enclitic personal pronoun -ma (originally acc. sg.), cf. DB I 19: tyašām hacāma aθahya „ce qui leur était ordonné". Consequently, the passive phrase „this is what was done by me" (as Kent translates OP ima tya manā kartam) could and should be rendered as *ma tya hacāma akariya (the 3 sg. impf. pass. akariyat appears actually twice in OP: DSf 37 and XPh 42).

The purpose of the present paper is to show that the Elamite (E.) and the Babylonian Akkadian (B.) versions accompanying most of the OP inscriptions supply additional arguments for the active character of the OP periphrastic perfect.

Whereas the Semitic Akkadian presents no major problems to-day, the structure of the apparently agglutinative Elamite — owing to its isolated position and relative scarcity of texts — is not yet clear in all details. According to recent grammars [6] the Elamite distinguishes three morphological classes: verbs, nominals and indeclinables.

The Elamite verbal base may appear either with personal suffixes, which in the Royal Achaemenid Elamite (RAE) — due to its loss of /h/ — differ from those in the Middle Elamite (ME):

	ME		RAE	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
1.	/h/	/hu/	/Ø/	/u/
2.	/t/	/ht/	/t/	/t/
3.	/š/	/liš/	/š/	/š/

or with the participle suffixes: active /n/ or passive /k/. Both participles may take the so-called „gender suffixes", usually accompanying nominals, but in RAE sometimes also verbs. These are as follows:

[6] H. H. Paper, The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenian Elamite, Ann Arbor 1955 (further quoted as: Paper); E. Reiner, The Elamite Language, in: Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung II. Band, 1. u. 2. Abschnitt, Lief. 2, Leiden/Köln 1969, pp. 54—118, (further quoted as: R. El.).

Locutive	/k/	e.g.	sunki-k, „I (the) king";
Allocutive	/t/	e.g.	na-n-t, „speak-ing-you"
Delocutive: animate sg.	/r/	e.g.	sunki-r, „he (the) king"
animate pl.	/p/	e.g.	sunki-p, „they (the) kings"

non-animate Ø or /me/ e.g. sunki-me „king-dom" (abstraction).

The tense value of the conjugated forms seems to be that of past, whereas the active participle with the „gender suffixes" serves as present, e.g. (h)utta-š „he did"; (h)utta-n-r, „he does"; (h)utta-n-p, „they do". There is no nominal declension (cf. R. El. § 5.2.6.3), except for the personal pronouns, which distinguish the nominative and the accusative (or perhaps an oblique):

	Sg.		Pl.	
	Nom.	Acc.	Nom.	Acc.
1.	u	un	nuku	nukun
2.	nu	nun	num	numun
3.	r-	r	p-	apun

However the RAE has a suffix -na, whose function resembles that of the genetive. Adverbials are formed by means of postpositions, e.g. u-ikki „to(wards) me"; Mata-p-ikki „the Medes"; u-ikki + mar „from (= by) me" [7].

Whereas the most pronounced function of the „gender suffixes" in ME is the categorizing one — they serve as exponents of grammatical concord — their function in RAE resembles rather that of number morphemes with nominals and that of enclitic pronouns with verbs. The third person „suffixes" are obviously related to the corresponding personal pronouns and this relationship might be explained by the demonstrative origin of both categories. The demonstrative quality of the elements -r- and -p- would render its generalized use as number morphemes in RAE easily understandable and in particular it might explain the puzzling use of

[7] In the so-called transposition (see R. El., p. 104), i.e. morpheme-for-morpheme translation which is adopted here for the interpretation of the Elamite material, the quoted examples may be rendered as follows: u-ikki „me-to"; u-ikki + mar „me-from"; Mata-p-ikki „Mede-Pl.-to(wards)".

the -i- suffix with the finite verb. It appears only in relative clauses starting with appa „which" (corresponding to OP tya), especially in those instances where the clause stands for the direct object of the main verb, cf. XPa 18f (= Wb., p. 108, § 4): mām Auramazdā pātuv utamaiy χšaçam utā tya manā kartam (K. p. 148: „Me may A. protect, and my kingdom, and what was built by me"); E. (lines 17—19): u Uramašta un viški-š-ni kutta tya manā kartam kutta appa u (h)utta-r; transposition: „my/me? Ahuramazda me protect-3sg.-may and king-dom and what I made-1sg.-it(acc.?)".

It is worth noting that clauses containing the demonstrative pronoun do not have -r after the verb, e.g. DB III 10 (= Wb., p. 44, § 47): ima tya manā kartam Parθavaiy (K. p. 127: „This is what was done by me in Parthia"); E. (78): (h)i u Partumaš (h)utta; „this I Parthia (-in?) did-1sg." Cf. also DB IV 3f (= Wb., p. 56, § 52): ima tya adam akunavam; E. (47): (h)i appa u (h)utta.

Assuming the pronominal character of -r (the view, which is adopted in this paper) the difference between these two types of clauses may be illustrated as follows: 1. (with -r): quod — (ego) feci — id (= quod feci); 2. (without -r): id — quod — (ego) feci.

This interpretation differs considerably from that of E. Reiner[8], who regards constructions like u (h)utta-r as a syntactical calque of the OP type manā kartam, perceived by the Elamite interpreters as meum factum and rendered by them according to the Elamite nominal possessive construction: modifier + noun + „gender suffix" of the modifier, cf. OP manā baⁿdaka, „my slave", E. u-lipa-r (spelled: u li-ba-ru-ri).

The following reasons speak against this conception: 1° — even allowing the hypothetical generalization of -r on the first person, an expected rendering of meum factum by this construction should be *u (h)utta-k-r, because Elamite clearly distinguishes the OP past participle (see below); 2° — the possessive construction with pronouns in RAE seems to be based on simple juxtaposition, cf. DB I 4: manā pitā Vištāspa, „my father (is/was) Hystaspes", E. u attata Mištaspa (consequently u lipa-r might be interpreted: „my slave — (is/was) he"); 3° — both Elamite versions of XPc translate OP utā tyamaiy kartam as: kutta appa (h)utta-r without

---

[8] E. Reiner, Calques sur le vieux-perse en élamite achéménide, BSL LV (1960), pp. 222—7.

the personal pronoun — an inadmissible omission in a possessive construction meum factum, but quite understandable in case of (ego) feci — id.

Below are listed all the examples of the OP periphrastic perfect together with their Elamite and Akkadian translations (so far extant)[9], arranged according to the slightly varying meaning of the phrases, as in Benv. p. 177f. Benveniste distinguished 8 types of phrases, of which the last two are not represented here, because no translations of them exist (the 7-th type appears in monolingual XPb and the 8-th one in DNb, which is nearly totally destroyed).

TYPE 1 — „voilà ce que j'ai fait":
DB I 27f (= Wb., p. 14, § 10): ima tya manā kartam pasāva yaθā χšāyaθya abavam (K. p. 119: „This is what was done by me after that I became king") E. (21f): hi ap-pa ¹ú hu-ud-da [za-u-mi-in aⁿu-ra-mas]-da-na me-ni sa-ap ap-pa ¹sunkuk-me du-mₐ

(h)i appa u (h)utta čaумin Uramašta-na men sap appa sunki-me dumₐ
„this what I did-1sg. grace Ahuramazda-of after as king-dom took-1sg."

B. (11): a-ga-a ša ana-ku e-pu-šu ina ṣilli ša ⁱiu̯ú-ri-mi-iz-da ár-ki ša a-na šarru a-tu-ru

DB II 91f (= Wb., p. 40, § 34): ima tya manā kartam Mādaiy (K. p. 124: „This is what was done by me in Media")
E. (67) hi ¹ú ¹ma-da-be ik-ki hu-ud-dₐ
(h)i u mata-p-ikki (h)utta; „this I Mede-PL-to(wards) did-1sg."
B. missing

DB III 10 (= Wb., p. 44, § 47): ima tya manā kartam Parθavaiy

---

[9] The OP is given in Kent's transcription; both Elamite and Akkadian versions are taken over from F. H. Weissbach, Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden, (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek III), Leipzig 1911 (further quoted as: Wb.), and its transcription — though slightly obsolete — has been retained. In order to save space the B. texts have been left without transcription into scriptio continua and without translation when it was not strictly necessary; the same holds for the repetitions of Elamite phrases. There is no unified system of scriptio continua for Elamite; in general the transcription of R. El. has been followed. I am greatly indebted to Prof. P. Naster of the Oriental Institute of the University of Leuven for his invaluable help in the interpretation of the Akkadian material.

E. (78) hi ᵘú ᴵpar-tu-maš hu-ud-da

B. missing

DB III 20f (= Wb., p. 46, § 39): *ima tya manā kartam Bāxtriyā*

E. (75) hi ᵘu ba-ak-ši-iš hu-ud-da

B. (71) a-ga-a ša ana-ku ina mati ba-aḫ-tar e-pu-šu

DB III 53 (= Wb., p. 50, § 44): *ima tya manā kartam Pārsaiy*

E. (19f) hi ᵘú ᴵpar-sin ik-ki hu-ud-da

B. (78) a-ga-a ša] a-na-ku ina matupar-su e-pu-šu

DB III 76 (= Wb. p. 54, § 48): *ima tya manā kartam Havau-vatiyā*

E. (34f) hi ᵘú har-ra-u-ma-ti-iš hu-ud-da

B. (84) ... ina mati a-ru-ha-at-ti e-pu-šu

Db IV 1f (= Wb., p. 56, § 51): *ima tya manā kartam Bābirauv*

E. (47) hi ᵘú ba-pi-[l]i ú[r hu-ud-da]

(h)i u Bapil iv (h)utta; „this I Babylon (to-)it did-1sg."

5. (89) a-ga-a ša ana-ku ina bapili e-pu-šu

TYPE 2 — „j'ai encore fait beaucoup (de choses)"

DB IV 46f (= Wb., p. 62, § 58): *utāmaiy aniyašciy rasiy astiy kartam*

E. (69f): da-a-ki-da Iú-ni-na ir-še-ik-ki [hu-ut]-tuk ([ša-ri])

tuykita uni-na iršeki (h)uttu-k /[ša-r)/

„other me-of mneh done /(is = „existing-SG"?)/

B. (100) ... ma-a-da ša e-pu-[šu]

TYPE 3 — „ce que j'ai fait"

Subtype A: *tya manā kartam*

DB IV 48f (= Wb., p. 62, § 58): ||*mā* (...) *avahyā parue ϑadayātaiy*|| *tya manā kartam naišim ima varnavātaiy* (K. p. 321: „/lest ... to him ... may not seem exeessive// what has been done by me (and) it not convince him")

E. (71): (...) ap-pa ᵘú-ni-na hu-ud-da-ak hu-pir-ri im-ni u-ri-in-ra

appa uni-na (h)utta-k (h)upi-r inni uri-n-r; „what me-of done this-SG not believ-ing-he"

B. (100) ... ma-la e-pu-šu [l]a i-ki-ip-pi (...)

DB IV 53f (= Wb., p. 64, § 60): *nūram ϑavām varnavatām tya manā kartam*

(K. p. 132: „Now let that which has been done by me convinee thee".)

E. (73f): am ᴵnu u-ru-iš ap-pa ᵘú hu-ud-da.

ant ... uvi-š appa u (h)utta; „now you believe-Imperativ what I did-1sg."

B. (101) at-ta ki-i-pi ša ana-ku e-pu-šu

Subtype B: *tyamaiy kartam*

XPd a17ff, b25ff (= Wb., p. 114, § 3): *mām Auramazdā pātuv hadā baɡaibiš utamaiy zšaɡam utā tyamaiy kartam* (K. p. 148: „Me may A. together with the gods proteet, and my kingdom, and what has been done by me")

E. (a11ff, b20ff): ᴵú ᵃⁿⁿ-ra-mas-da un nu-iš-gi-iš-ni ᵃⁿⁿa-ap-pi-be i-da-ka kn-ud-da su-un-((ku))-uk-me ku-ud-da ap-pa hn-ud-da-ra *u Uramašta un niški-š-ni vapi-p-itaka kutta sunki-me kutta appa (h)utta-r*; „my/me? Ahuramazda me proteet-3s.g.-may god-PL-with and king-dom and what (I-)did-1sg.-it"

B. (a10f, b20f): a-na-ku ⁱⁱᵘa-ḫu-ru-ma-az-da-’ li-iṣ-ṣur-an-ni it-ti ilanⁱᵐᵉˢ u a-na šarru-ú-[ti-ia u a]-na e-pu-uš-šu

XV 25ff (= Wb., p. 118, § 3): idem

E. (26f): (...) ku-ud-da ša-iš-ša-[um kn-ud-da ap-pa ᴵu hu]-ud-da-ri *kutta šaš(š)am kutta appa u (h)utta-r*; „and zšaɡam and what I did-1sg.-it"

B. (27) (...) ú ša a-na-ku e-pu-šu

TYPE 4 —„ils n'ont pas fait autant que j'ai fait"

DB IV 59ff (= Wb., p. 64, § 59): *tyaiy paruvā zšayaϑiyā yātā āha avaišām avā vaiy astiy kartam yaϑā manā vašnā Auramazdāha hamahyāyā ϑarda kartam* (K. p. 132: „Those who were the former kings, as long as they lived, by them was not done thus as by the favour of A. was done by me in one and the same year")

E. (72f): ᴵak-ka-be Isunkuk-ip ir-pi-ip-pi ku-iš ša-be-ip hu-pi-be-na hi nu-ib-ba-ak im-ni hu-ud-da-ak sa-ap ᴵu[be-ul-ki-ma za-u-mi-in anʲu-ra-mas-da-na hu-ud-da

akka-p sunki-p irpi-p kuš(?) sa-p (h)upi-p-na (h)i-nupa-k(?) inni (h)utta-k sap u pel-ki-ma čaumin Uramašta-na (h)utta „who-PL king-PL old-PL while existing-PL, this-PL-of (meaning uncertain; Paper, p. 54: „all the time before") not done as I year-one-in graee Ahuramazda-of did-1sg."

B. (the relevant parts of the sentence are missing)

TYPE 5 —„ainsi ils ont livré bataille"

DB II 27, 36, 42, 47, 56, 62, 98; DB III 9, 19, 40, 47, 64, 69 — *avaϑāšām hamaranam kartam*

E. has everywhere: ša-par-rak-um-me hu-ud-da-iš šaparaku-me(?) (h)utta-(h)š, ,,battle (they-)made-3pl." In Akkadian the verb is always translated by 3 pl.m. perfecti ītepšū, though the spelling and the word-order vary, cf. si-el-tam i-te-ip-šu-' (Wb. p. 31, §25), i-te-ip-šu ša-al-tam (Wb., p. 35, §28).

TYPE 6 — ,,ce que j'ai fait et ce que mon père a fait"

XPa 18ff (=Wb., p. 108, §4): *mām Auramazdā pātuv utamaiy tya manā kartam utā tyamaiy piça kartam*

E. (18f) (...) ku-ud-da ap-pa ʳú hu-ud-da-ra ku-ud-da ap-pa ʳad-da-da hu-ut-taš-da

kutta appa u (h)utta-r kutta appa attata (h)utta-š-ta ,,and what I did-1sg.-it and what father did-3sg.-TA (definite past)"

B. (19) ... u ša a-na-ku e-pu-šu-šú u ša abu-ú-a i-pu-uš-šú

XPc a12ff, b20ff (=Wb., p. 112, §3): *mām Auramazdā patuv hadā bagaibiš utā tyamaiy kartam utā tyamaiy piça Dārayavahauš X Šhyā kartam*

E. (a12f, b21f): (...) ku-ud-da ap-pa hu-ud-da-ra ku-ud-da ap-pa ʳad-da-da ʳda-ri-ia-ma-u-iš ʳšunkuk hu-ut-taš-da

B. (a11f, b27f): (...) ù ša a-na-ku e-pu-uš-šú ù ša ʳda-a-ri-ia-a-muš šarru abu-ú-a at-tu-ú-a i-pu-uš-šu

The following table lists all the corresponding translations:

	Old Persian	Elamite	Akkadian
1 sg.	(a) *manā kartam*	u (h)utta / u (h)utta-r / uni-na (h)utta-k	ēpuš(u) / 1 sg. praet. (subj.)
	(b) -maiy kartam	(h)utta-r / u (h)utta-r	ēpuš(u)
	(c) -maiy astiy kartam	uni-na (h)utta-k [ša-r]	ēpuš(u)
2 sg.	—	—	—
3 sg.	(piça) kartam	(h)utta-š-ta	ipuš(u) / 3 sg. praet. (subj.)
1 pl.	—	—	
2 pl.	—	—	
3 pl.	(a) -šām kartam	(h)utta-(h)š	ītepšū / 3 pl. m. perf.
	(b) -šām astiy kartam	(h)upi-p-na (h)utta-k	missing

If one accepts the interpretation of the Elamite -r as the enclitic pronoun, as proposed above, and regards -ta as a suffix, expressing ,,a complete and final action" [10], only two different Elamite patterns of translation remain: 1. finite verb, 2. genetive of the pronoun *plus* past participle.

The second pattern is an obvious calque of the OP periphrastic perfect of the type *manā kartam* (with a possible variant with a co-pula, E. ša-ri [11], which is, however, a conjectural restoration). That this construction has been regarded as active by the interpreters is seen from the alternative — and predominant — use of the Elamite finite verb forms and from the consistent use of the active preterite and perfect forms of the Akkadian *epēšu(m)* ,,to do, to make" [12]. Although these two arguments are not conclusive in themselves, because both versions show certain liberty of trans-lation, the observed regularity of employment of active forms

[10] R. T. Hallock, *The finite Verb in Achaemenid Elamite*, Journal of Near Eastern Studies XVIII (1959), p. 6f; cf. *R. El.* §4.6.3.

[11] In DB IV 46 (=*Wb.*, p. 62, §58) with a gap of ,,höchstens 3 Zeichen"; elsewhere, e.g. DB IV 51 (=*Wb.*, p. 64, §59), Weissbach reads: *lib-* instead of *ša-* (this reading has been corrected to *ša-* in this paper). Regarding *ša-ri* in the sense of copula, see Hallock, *op. cit.* p. 19, where it is interpreted as an adjectival nominal meaning ,,being, existing".

[12] An additional argument for the active character of the OP construction may also be found in the fragmentary Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription (see A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.*, Oxford 1923) where, according to E. Y. Kutscher, the translation of *manā kartam* survives in three places and, each of them is represented by the Semitic perfect *qaṭal* ('bdt)"; see E. Y. Kut-scher, *Two 'passive' constructions in Aramaic in the light of Persian*, p. 6; (offprint from: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies*, Jerusalem, 1965). I am indebted to Prof. E. Lipiński of the Oriental Institute of the University of Leuven for bringing it to my attention. Kutscher's paper is very relevant to the problem of the OP periphrastic perfect: it puts forward strong evidence that this construction has been later adopted in Eastern Aramaic as the type *qṭyl-* (an exact copy of *manā kartam*, Aram. *ʿabīd lī*), which became generalized for both transitives and intransitives in certain dialects and employed as preterite (cf. *op. cit.* p. 15) — a development, which forms an interesting parallel with that of Middle Iranian.

E. has everywhere: ša-par-rak-um-me hu-ud-da-iš šaparaku-me(?) (h)utta-(h)š, „battle (they-)made-3pl."
In Akkadian the verb is always translated by 3 pl.m. perfecti itepšū, though the spelling and the word-order vary, cf. si-el-tam i-te-ip-šu-' (Wb. p. 31, §25), i-te-ip-šu ša-al-tam (Wb., p. 35, §28).
TYPE 6 — „ce que j'ai fait et ce que mon père a fait"
XPa 18ff (= Wb., p. 108, § 4): mām Auramazdā pātuv utamaiy χšaçam utā tya manā kartam utā tyamaiy piça kartam
E. (18f) (...) ku-ud-da ap-pa ʰú hu-ud-da-ra ku-ud-da ap-pa ʰad-da-da hu-ut-taš-da

kutta appa u (h)utta-r kutta appa attata (h)utta-š-ta „and what I did-1sg.-it and what father did-3sg.-TA (definite past)"
B. (19) ... u ša a-na-ku e-pu-šu-šú u ša abu-ú-a i-pu-uš-šú
XPe a12ff, b20ff (= Wb., p. 112, § 3): mām Auramazdā patuv hadā bagaibiš utā tyamaiy kartam utā tyamaiy piça Dārayavahauš Xšhyā kartam
E. (a12f, b21f): (...) ku-ud-da ap-pa hu-ud-da-ra ku-ud-da ap-pa ʰad-da-da ʰda-ri-ia-ma-u-iš ʰsunkuk hu-ut-taš-da
B. (a11f, b27f): (...) ù ša a-na-ku e-pu-uš-šú ù ša ʰda-a-ri-ia-a-muš šarru abu-ú-a at-tu-ú-a i-pu-uš-šu
The following table lists all the corresponding translations:

	Old Persian	Elamite	Akkadian	
1 sg.	(a) manā kartam	u (h)utta / u (h)utta-r / uni-na (h)utta-k	ēpuš(u)	1 sg. praet. (subj.)
	(b) -maiy kartam	(h)utta-r / u (h)utta-r	ēpuš(u)	
	(c) -maiy astiy kartam	uni-na (h)utta-k [ša-r]	ēpuš(u)	
2 sg.	—		—	
3 sg.	(piça) kartam	(h)utta-š-ta	ipuš(u)	3 sg. praet. (subj.)
1 pl.	—		—	
2 pl.	—		—	
3 pl.	(a) -šām kartam	(h)utta-(h)š	itepšū	3 pl. m. perf.
	(b) -šām astiy kartam	(h)upi-p-na (h)utta-k	missing	

If one accepts the interpretation of the Elamite -r as the enclitic pronoun, as proposed above, and regards -ta as a suffix, expressing „a complete and final action"[10], only two different Elamite patterns of translation remain: 1. finite verb, 2. genitive of the pronoun plus past participle.

The second pattern is an obvious calque of the OP periphrastic perfect of the type manā kartam (with a possible variant with a copula, E. šā-ri[11], which is, however, a conjectural restoration). That this construction has been regarded as active by the interpreters is seen from the alternative — and predominant — use of the Elamite finite verb forms and from the consistent use of the active preterite and perfect forms of the Akkadian epēšu(m) „to do, to make"[12]. Although these two arguments are not conclusive in themselves, because both versions show certain liberty of translation, the observed regularity of employment of active forms

[10] R. T. Hallock, The finite Verb in Achaemenid Elamite, Journal of Near Eastern Studies XVIII (1959), p. 6f; cf. R. El. § 4. 6. 3.

[11] In DB IV 46 (= Wb., p. 62, § 58) with a gap of „höchstens 3 Zeichen"; elsewhere, e.g. DB IV 51 (= Wb., p. 64, § 59), Weissbach reads: lib- instead of šá- (this reading has been corrected to šá- in this paper). Regarding šá-ri in the sense of copula, see Hallock, op. cit. p. 19, where it is interpreted as an adjectival nominal meaning „being, existing".

[12] An additional argument for the active character of the OP construction may also be found in the fragmentary Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription (see A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C., Oxford 1923) where, according to E. Y. Kutscher, „the translation of manā kartam survives in three places and, each of them is represented by the Semitic perfect qaṭal ('bdt)"; see E. Y. Kutscher, Two 'passive' constructions in Aramaic in the light of Persian, p. 6; (offprint from: Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies, Jerusalem, 1965). I am indebted to Prof. E. Lipiński of the Oriental Institute of the University of Leuven for bringing it to my attention. Kutscher's paper is very relevant to the problem of the OP periphrastic perfect: it puts forward strong evidence that this construction has been later adopted in Eastern Aramaic as the type qṭyl l- (an exact copy of manā kartam, Aram. ʿabīd lī), which became generalized for both transitives and intransitives in certain dialects and employed as preterite (cf. op. cit. p. 15) — a development, which forms an interesting parallel with that of Middle Iranian.

gives weight to the strongest argument, namely to the fact that Elamite had a special passive construction, which has never been used for the translation of the OP periphrastic perfect. The Elamite passive appears to be a loan-translation from the OP type: *hacāma aθahya* (lit. „from me it was told"), E. *u-ikki + mar tiri¹/u-k* (lit. me-„from told").

Below are listed the four instances of the OP passive construction, mentioned by Benveniste (op. cit., p. 178):

DB I 19f (= Wb., p. 12, § 7): *tyašām hacāma aθahya zŝaparā raucapatīvā ava akunavayatā* (K. p. 119 „what was said unto them by me either by night or by day, that was done")

E. (16f): ap-pa ᴵú [...] ap ti-ri-ia ᵃⁿŝi-ut ma-na ᵃⁿ[na-an ma-na hu-u]h-be hu-ud-da-iš
appa u ... ap tiri-a šut-ma-na nan-ma-na (h)upi (h)utta-(h)š „what I ... to-them (resumptive pr.) said-1sg.-Connective night-in-of day-in-of this (they-)did-3pl."

B. (8) ... û-mu a-na ša-a-šu ip-pu-šu-'

DNa 20f (= Wb., p. 88, § 3): *tyašām hacāma aθahya ava akunava* appa u ikki mar ap tur-ri-ka hu-be hu-ut-tuk
appa u-ikki + mar ap turi-k (h)upi (h)uttu-k „what me-from to-them told this done"

B. (10f): ša la-pani-ia at-tu-u-a ig-gab-ba-aš-šu-nu ana ap-pit-tu ip-pu-uš-šu-'

XPh 14 (see Paper, p. 84): OP, E. and B. identical with DNa 20f.

DB I 23f (= Wb., p. 12; § 8): *yaθāšām hacāma aθahya avaθā akunavayatā*

E. (19) ap-pa an-ka ᴵú ik-ki mar ap ti-ri-ik-ka hu-uh-be hu-ud-[da-iš];
apank u-ikki + mar ap tiri-k (h)upi (h)utta-(h)š „as? (cf. Paper, p. 108) me-from to-them told this (they-)did-3pl."

B. (9) ša la-pa-ni-ia at-tu-u-a ...

Exept for DB I 19f, where Elamite has a finite verb (but where the most probable restoration of *u*[...] as *u-ikkimar* would suggest an erroneous contamination of active and passive construction) all the remaining translations have the same passive: the pseudoablative *plus* past participle. Also the Akkadian translation has a passive here: *ša lapāniya attūā iqqabbaššunu* (lit. „what-before-my-own is-being-told-they(!)"), where the verb is

the 3-d sg. m. praes. (in the ventive form) of the passive N-stem. That the opposition *active : passive* in OP has been distinctly felt by the interpreters, shows the active paraphrase of the same sentene, cf. DNa 36f (= Wb., p. 88, § 4): *tyašām adam aθaham ava akunava* (K. p. 138: „what I said to them, that they did");

E. (30): ap-pa ú ap tur-ri-ra hu-be hu-ut-taš
appa u ap turi-r (h)upi (h)utta-(h)š; „what I to-them said-1sg.-it this (they-)did-3pl."

B. (23f) ša ana-ku a-gab-ba-aš-ši-na-atú ip-pu-uš-ša-'
ša anāku aqabbaššinatu ippuša; „what I tell (1 sg. praes., ventive form) + them (acc. encl. pron. 3. pl. fem.) they-do (3. pl. fem. — probably because of agreement with *mātāte* „lands", pl. fem.)".

It is worth mentioning that the OP passive verb without the agent was translated in Elamite with a simple participle, cf. Dsf 38 (cf. Paper, p. 52, with wrong line-number): *tya idā akariya* „what here was done", E. ap-pa hi-ma hu-ut-tuk. The same unaccompanied participle has also been used in Elamite for the translation of the OP *karta(m)* used in the nominal sense „what has been made (= constructed)"; also Akkadian often uses here the passive participle *epuš* (although the spelling is remarkable) [13]. Cf. the following examples:

DNa 48f (= Wb., p. 90, § 5): *aita tya kartam ava viŝam vašnā Auramazdāhā akunavam* (K. p. 138: „This which has been done, all that by the will of A. I did")

E. (39f) hu-be ap-pa hu-ut-tuk-ka hu-be mar-ri-da za-u-mi-in anᵤ-ra-mas-da-na hu-ud-da
(h)upi appa (h)uttuk-k (h)upi mari-ta čaumin Uramašta-na (h)utta „this what made this all-whatsoever grace Ahuramazda-of (I-)did-1sg."

B. (30f) a-ga-a gab-bi ša íp-šu ina šilli ša ⁱᵘₐ-ḫu-[ur]-ma-az-da-e-te-puš

---

[13] B. *ip-šu-'* as a rendering of the passive participle (usual Akkadian form: *epuš*) seems to be certain from DPe (= Wb., p. 80), where OP: *ardastāna aθaⁿgaina Dārayavahauš Xŝhyā viθiyā karta* (K. p. 135: „Stone window-frame, made in the house of King Darius"), is translated into B. as: ku-bᵤ-ur-ri-e mu-uš-la-la i-na bi-it ᴵda-a-ri-ḭa-a-muš šar-ri ip-šu-' (cf. also E. with passive participle: har-da-iš-da-na Harᴵᵈᴵⁱⁱ ..ᵤ? ᴵda-ri-ḭa-na-u-iš ᴵsunkuk uelmannuᵈ-e-na hu-ut-tuk-ka).

15*

XPa 13f (= Wb., p. 108, §3): *vašnā aniyašciy vaibam kartam anā Pārsā tya adam akunavam utamaiy tya pitā akunauš* „Much other good (construction) was built within this (city) Persepolis, which I built and which my father built"

E. (12ff): ir-še-ki da-a-e te ši-iš-ni-na hu-ut-tuk ba-ir-ša hi ma ap-pa ¹ú hu-ud-da-ra ku-ud-da ap-pa ¹ad-da-da hu-ut-taš-da *iršeki tayte šišni-na (h)uttu-k Pars-(h)i-ma appa u (h)utta-r kutta appa attata (h)utta-š-ta;* „much other good-of made Pars-this-in what I did-1sg.-it and what father did-3sg.-TA"

B. (12) u sa-nu-ú-ti-ma ma-du-ú-tu tab-ba-nu-ú-tu e-te-pu-uš ina matʳpar-sa a-ga-' ša a-na-ku e-pu-uš-šú u ša abu-ú-a i-pu-uš-šú

XPa 15f (= Wb., p. 108, §3): *tyapatiy kartam vainatiy vaibam avra visam vašna Auramazdāhā akumā* (K. p. 148: „Whatever good construction is seen, all that by the favour of A. we built")

E. (14f): ap-pa ša-rak hu-ut-tuk-ka ši-ia-ma-ak ši-iš-ni-na lu-be mar-ri-da za-u-mi-in anⁱra-mas-da-na hu-ud-du-ud-da *appa ša-r-k (?) (h)uttu-k čaya-ma-k šišni-na (h)upi mari-ta čaumin Uramašta-na (h)uttu-(h)u-TA;* „what been (?) built to-be-seen (? lit.: „see-Future-Part.Perf.") good-of this all-whatsoever grace Ahuramazda-of (we-)did-1pl.-Completed Action".

B. (15f): u ša ip-ša-' im-mar-ru tab-ba-nu-ú ul-lu-ú-tu gab-bi ina şilli ša ⁱⁿᵃ-hu-ru-ma-az-da-' ni-te-pu-uš

It is interesting to observe that the Elamite type *uni-na (h)uttu/a-k* is never employed except for the translation of the OP periphrastic perfect. The reason for this reluctant use must have been that it was at that time a recent calque and probably regarded as incorrect. On the other hand the passive calque seems to have been quite widespread in RAE, as can be seen from the free translation of DB I 72 (= Wb., p. 22, § 15), where the OP *tya adam akunavam* is translated: ap-pa [¹ú ik-ki mar] hu-ud-da-ak.

In the light of the preceding discussion it may be concluded that both the Elamite and Akkadian translations offer an un-equivocal evidence for the active character of the OP periphrastic perfect. Unfortunately their evidence is much less informative about the position of this construction in the OP tense system. The OP periphrastic perfect emerged apparently as a renovation of the perfective past when the opposition *perfectivity : imper-fectivity* became endangered by the loss of the original OP perfect

(which is never used in indicative in Achaemenid inscriptions) and by the indiscriminate use of imperfect and aorist as a general past tense; however, the perfectivity of the OP periphrastic perfect cannot be established beyond doubt on the basis of its translations into Elamite and Akkadian. For these translations Akkadian uses both preterite (which originally had the value of punctualis) and perfect (which had the value of present perfect) [14], with the predominance of preterite, a fact which would point toward a „general past" value of the OP construction. It could be argued that this evidence is worthless, because the language of the Babylonian Akkadian versions is obviously corrupt; on the other hand, however, it shows a very strong influence of OP as far as syntax is concerned [15]. Taking this into account one could argue that the seeming lack of consistence in the use of tenses in Akkadian (cf. the indiscriminate use of preterite and perfect in the translations of the OP imperfect forms as well, e.g. DB I 68 vs. DB IV 40) was a reflection of the state of flux in which the OP tense system already found itself at that time. Consequently it could be argued that the weakening of the perfective character of the OP periphrastic perfect — which later led to the generalized use cf forms of the type *man kart* as preterite in Middle Persian and necessitated the emergence of a secondary perfect of the type *kart-ak ham*, NP. *karde am* through the analogy with the in-transitive pattern) — may be traced back to the language of the Achaemenian inscriptions. But here the evidence of the trilingual texts remains equivocal.

[14] A. Ungnad, L. Matouš, *Grammatik des Akkadischen*, 4-e Aufl., München 1964, §§ 56—7.

[15] O. Rössler, *Untersuchungen über die akkadische Fassung der Achämenideninschriften*, Diss., Berlin 1938.